

MINUTES
COLUMBUS PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
MAY 3RD 2006 AT 4:00 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
123 WASHINGTON STREET
COLUMBUS, INDIANA

Members Present: Dave Fisher (President), Pat Zeigler, Steve Ruble, Dave Bonnell, Mark Gerstle, John Hatter, Brian Russell, Joan Tupin-Crites, Jesse Brand and Tom Finke (Liaison).

Members Absent: Tom King and Jack Heaton.

Staff Present: Jeff Bergman, Sondra Bohn, Thom Weintraut, Laura Thayer, Randy Aspenson and Alan Whitted (Deputy City Attorney).

CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes of the April 5, 2006 meeting.

Motion: Ms. Zeigler made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Bonnell seconded the motion and it carried unanimously by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION

None

NEW BUSINESS REQUIRING COMMISSION ACTION

PUD-06-01: SHADOW CREEK FARMS SECTION 4 FINAL PUD – is a request by Beazer Homes for approval of a Final PUD Plan for Section 4 of Shadow Creek Farms. The property consists of 14.03 acres and is located south of County Road 200 South between County Roads 225 West and 150 West in the City of Columbus.

PP-06-01: SHADOW CREEK FARMS SECTION 4 MAJOR SUBDIVISION – is a request by Beazer Homes to subdivide 14.03 acres into 80 lots. The property is located south of County Road 200 South between County Roads 225 West and 150 West in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Thayer presented the staff information on these requests.

Ms. Judy Weerts-Hall, Land Use Planner with Stephen D. Mears and Sharon Brown, Land Entitlement Manager for Beazer Homes represented the petitioner.

Ms. Weerts-Hall stated that there was a difference in the number of lots listed on the final PUD for

Section Four in the Preliminary Plat versus the Phasing Plan. She stated that has been corrected. She stated that there are 80 lots in Section 4. Ms. Brown stated that the information that was in the packets specified the home series that would be recommended in Section 4. She stated that there are seventeen different floor plans from which homebuyers can choose. She

stated there is diversity in what has been proposed and all the different options will keep the community looking different and diverse.

Mr. Fisher stated the decision before the Commission is whether enough information has been provided for a decision to be made.

Ms. Zeigler asked if all the design could be done in three or four variations of color. Ms. Brown stated yes. She stated there were 8 to 10 different color options available in the siding alone. She stated the buyers would make those selections when they come to the design studio. Ms. Brown left a booklet with the Commission that show, the different home types that are proposed for Section 4 and Section 5.

Mr. Fisher opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Fisher closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that the main concern is the design guidelines. He stated that staff has reviewed the Final PUD for consistency with the Preliminary PUD and also discussed the Phasing Plan, which is part of the Preliminary PUD. He stated part of the staff's review included landscaping, the common areas, and access to the park, which is through Section 4, and the lot sizes and widths. He stated all of those are consistent with the Preliminary PUD. He stated that the guidelines presented would not meet the Preliminary PUD specification. They do not provide detailed information regarding what requirements are being imposed for the design of the structures. He stated this is consistent with the previous sections; however, he stated that staff would recommend these two requests be approved.

Mr. Ruble asked if design guidelines were enforceable by the Planning Department. Mr. Bergman stated that the design guideline would be a component of the PUD zoning

Ms. Zeigler stated much time has been spent in the past discussing details for this PUD when it was originally developed. She stated that the goal was to obtain a variety of houses in all the different phases.

Mr. Ruble asked if Mr. Bergman was comfortable that the original materials that were submitted give Beazer the flexibility that is needed to change treatments on the structures themselves. Mr. Bergman stated yes and the binder that was submitted does that.

Motion: Mr. Bonnell made a motion to approve PUDF 06-01 with the following condition: The design guidelines submitted at this meeting were approved and are included in the requirements for Section 4. Ms. Tupin-Crites seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

Motion: Mr. Bonnell made a motion to approve PP-06-01. Mr. Hatter seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

PUD-06-02: SHADOW CREEK FARMS SECTION 5 FINAL PUD– is a request by Beazer Homes for approval of a Final PUD Plan for Section 5 of Shadow Creek Farms. The property consists of 43.74 acres and is located south of County Road 200 South between County Roads 225 West and 150 West in the City of Columbus.

PP-06-02: SHADOW CREEK FARMS SECTION 5 MAJOR SUBDIVISION – a request by Beazer Homes to subdivide 43.74 acres into 111 lots. The property is located south of County Road 200 South between County Roads 225 West and 150 West in the City of Columbus.

Ms. Thayer presented the staff information on this request.

Ms. Judy Weerts-Hall, Land Use Planner with Stephen D. Mears and Sharon Brown, Land Entitlement Manager for Beazer Homes represented the petitioner.

Mr. Fisher asked where the trees in the common area would be located. Ms. Thayer stated they are proposing some trees along the back of lots and they are proposing landscaping in this area.

Ms. Tupin-Crites asked if that was along Shadow Creek Blvd. Ms. Thayer stated yes and on the back of lots 497- 513, which are facing along to the common area.

Mr. Fisher stated that one of the things that have been mentioned is that the houses would be set back at least 25 feet from the street. He stated that in these sections, where alleys are proposed that 20 feet could be the requirement. Ms. Thayer stated that the Plan Commission has the authority to approve setbacks. Ms. Thayer stated that there was no particular set back line being proposed and there is a drainage and utility easement on the Shadow Creek Blvd. side of those lots. Mr. Bergman stated the minimum setback is 25 feet, but the Plan Commission could approve the houses.

Mr. Bergman stated they have two options, if there was an agreement by the Plan Commission and with the applicant and if there was an intent to seek out a certain design character in those areas where you do not have a garage door facing the street the setback could be a built to line as opposed to a setback line, which would mandate that some part of the house come up and touch that build. Mr. Bergman stated that a 25-foot setback line allows for a driveway that cars can park in, and without the need for a driveway in front, it could be a different character for the house.

Ms. Weerts-Hall stated that Beazer does not have a preference for the set back line for the rear load lots. She stated it was a good ideal to have some variety but there is a 20-foot easement along Shadow Creek Drive in the front. She stated if the Commission wanted the setback closer than 20 feet that would require the easement to be relocated.

Mr. Bill Bryant from Stoeppelwerth & Associates stated that landscaping behind the lots was not shown because of the overhead utilities. He stated tree plantings were not allowed in that area. Mr. Bergman asked if the terms of the easement specified that no trees of any kind could be planted in the easement. Mr. Bryant stated typically the power company has a right to take a tree down if it is planted in the easement. Mr. Bryant stated that it does not say they cannot be planted. Ms. Brown stated that as an alternative to trees for lots on the north side of Creek Stone Drive they are proposing to use prairie grasses in the common areas. She stated that this was to keep from having to mow and maintain huge areas of green space. Ms. Brown stated it helps to maintain a natural atmosphere. She stated that might be an option at the rear of those lots. Ms. Weerts-Hall stated that additional landscaping had been added to the plan for Section 5.

Mr. Gerstle asked what the outstanding issues were. Ms. Thayer stated several parking spaces have been added and additional trees have been placed along Shadow Creek Boulevard. She stated the trees have also been added to most common areas. Ms. Thayer stated there was still

concern regarding the large common area where the utility easement is located. She stated that a few more trees or smaller shrubs could be added in this area and that would add more definition to the line separating the lots from the common area. Ms. Thayer stated the landscaping along County Road 150 West was adequate. Ms. Thayer stated the only other issue is the set back for the rear load houses.

Mr. Ruble stated that there is no cross section shown on the alley and he stated he would like to see the same section on the alley as that for the streets.

Ms. Tupin-Crites asked if the homeowner would have an option to do their own landscaping against the common area. Ms. Brown stated yes. Ms. Tupin-Crites asked if the prairie grass would be on the common area. Ms. Brown stated that was what they were suggesting. They would be planted in a uniform line that would delineate the whole section.

Mr. Bergman stated that the design components were different here with the rear load product as opposed to the other products in the development. Ms. Brown stated that there are fewer floor plans with the rear load lots than with the rear load lots than with the other plans.

Mr. Bergman asked if there would be a 25-foot setback from the alley for the garage. Ms. Brown stated that her assumption was if you move the house forward, there would be the same basic driveway. Mr. Bergman stated it would be prudent for the 25-foot setback to be required in the alley, therefore moving the front set back forward.

Mr. Fisher opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Fisher closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend approval with the following conditions: (1) Show "no access" on front of rear load lots. (2) Reduce front setback to 15 feet for rear-load lots. (3) Increase setbacks from alleys to 25 feet. (4) Provide pavement cross-section for the alley. and (5) Submit revised landscape plan to planning staff that shows plantings that about the common area.

Ms. Zeigler made a motion to approve PUD-06-02 with the following conditions: (1) Show "no access" on front of rear load lots. (2) Reduce front setback to 15 feet for rear-load lots. (3) Increase setbacks from alleys to 25 feet. (4) Provide pavement cross-section for the alley and (5) Submit revised landscape plan to planning staff that shows plantings that about the common area. Mr. Gerstle seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

Mr. Bergman stated that the staff would recommend approval of PP-06-02 with the following conditions: (1) Correct the note on the plat regarding number of lots. (2) Show "no access" on front of rear load lots. (3) Reduce front setback on rear load lots to 15 feet. (4) Add a rear setback of 25 feet on rear load lots

Mr. Ruble made a motion to approve PP-06-02 with the following conditions: (1) Correct the note on the plat regarding number of lots. (2) Show "no access" on front of rear load lots. (3) Reduce front setback on rear load lots to 15 feet. (4) Add a rear setback of 25 feet on rear load lots. Mr. Bonnell seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

PP-06-03: SPRUCE RIDGE MAJOR SUBDIVISION: – a request by Todd Conwell, Conwell Properties, LLC, to subdivide 44.76 acres into 65 lots. The property is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Goeller Boulevard and Goeller Court in the City of Columbus.

Mr. Weintraut presented the staff information on this request.

Mr. E.R. Gray with E.R Gray & Associates and Todd Conwell represented the petitioners.

Mr. Gray stated there have been previous attempts to develop this site and the main issue is there is only a 22-foot strip from Two Mile House Road back to the property. He stated there was no other access into the property.

Mr. Conwell stated he has been involved in construction for a period of years. He stated he found this property when bidding the site for the new Sam's Club excavating. He stated he would like to create a community at this site. He stated Conwell Properties is located at 21555 East 400 North, Hartsville, IN.

Mr. Gray stated staff had recommended that this be continued, but he stated they would like to proceed with this request. He stated he felt they had met the Subdivision Control Ordinance.

Mr. Gray stated they were in agreement with the pavement width for the new local streets of less than 30 feet. He stated they are proposing the width to be 26 feet. Mr. Ruble stated they would be limited to parking on one side of the street.

He stated they agreed with the stub street connection to the undeveloped property to the south. Mr. Gray stated that the owner to the south would rather not construct the road down to that property. He stated what they are proposing is to set that corridor aside as a block and deed that property to the adjoining owner to the south. They have stated in a letter that they would pay for the extension.

He stated that Lot 65 would gain access from the cul-de-sac on Two Mile House Road, which currently does not have sidewalks and is substandard in pavement width for emergency vehicles to navigate smoothly. Mr. Gray stated they have shown on the plans that they intend to fill in the center of the cul-de-sac. He stated they have looked at the turn radius templates and that will meet the turning around need.

Mr. Gray stated that the southeast turn of Colorado Way has two centerline radii of 100 feet, the ordinance requires a minimum of 200 feet for a centerline radius and they are asking for a modification from this. Mr. Gray stated that there is some way Colorado Way could be addressed, even though it runs in different directions.

Mr. Bergman stated he wanted to address two of the items. He stated that on Colorado Way the solution is as simple as taking Black Hills Drive and turning it to the south where it is currently labeled as Colorado Way. He stated Black Hills Drive would be on the north and east sides of the loop and Colorado Way would be the road that comes in on the south side of the loop. Mr. Gray stated they agreed with this. Mr. Bergman stated that on the stub street connection staff would be reluctant to believe that the block deeded to the adjoining property owner would be adequate answer. He stated there are three options: (1) No right of way, no stub street at all, (2) Some type of reserved right-of-way, which is similar to a Block, but puts the property in the control of the City of Columbus, and (3) Build the stub street. Mr. Gray stated they would be in agreement with the reserved right of way.

Mr. Brand stated he understood the concept, but asked where the road is going to be. Mr. Conwell stated between Lot 24 and Lot 25. He asked if this would be a dedicated easement. Mr. Gray stated that the reserve right of way would be 50 feet and it would incorporate the drainage and utility easement.

Ms. Zeigler stated she did not think the street width should be reduced to 26 feet. She stated the lots were large and considering this is a new subdivision should follow what the ordinance says, which is 30 feet. She expressed concerns regarding parking cars on the side of the streets.

Mr. Fisher asked if Lot 65 would be accessed from the cul-de-sac on Two Mile House Road. Mr. Gray stated there are concerns that there is an existing turn around with an existing cul-de-sac located there. He stated that the City Engineers Office did not feel that it would provide adequate turning for emergency vehicles. Mr. Gray stated they are proposing to fill the center of the cul-de-sac. He stated they would dig out the existing soils, put in stone base and put in asphalt. Mr. Ruble stated this was pending review by their office.

Mr. Fisher asked about changing the name of Black Hills Court to something else. Mr. Weintraut stated that this has not been discussed previously. He stated some of the names have been changed previously. Mr. Gray stated they would be willing to change the name to something else.

Mr. Brand asked if it would be a good idea to connect Goeller Boulevard to Two Mile House Road. Mr. Ruble stated he was not sure how practical that would be. Mr. Ruble asked if he was talking about running the cul-de-sac through to Goeller. Mr. Brand stated yes. Mr. Gray stated when Woodcrest was developed that connection was terminated and the cul-de-sac was installed at that time to prevent one more access onto Goeller.

Mr. Gray stated that adequacy for an emergency vehicle from Two Mile House Road to the cul-de-sac on Black Hills Court has been discussed with the Fire Department. He stated his proposal is to asphalt of sixteen-foot wide alley from his project out to Two Mile House Road. Mr. Gray stated there is only a private place there now and it is his feeling that he has met the criteria for access for the emergency vehicles.

Mr. Gray addressed the design of Goeller Boulevard and the new subdivision street, Colorado Way, with reduced adequacy to handle turning lanes and fire equipment access. He stated that they have greater radii than what the ordinance requires and have worked with the Fire Department. He stated the incoming lane was wider than what was required. In addition, has met what the Fire Department feels they need for access. Mr. Gray stated it was their opinion they that met the Thoroughfare Plan. Mr. Gray stated they have addressed the emergency access and it is suitable for the site.

Mr. Ruble read what the Thoroughfare Plan has to say regarding access. He stated that all subdivisions with more than 30 lots should have at least two points of access to adjoining streets so that if one access point were closed due to a traffic accident or street maintenance work, motorists would still have access to and from the subdivision. He stated it was his opinion that a 16-foot wide alley or ribbon of asphalt does not provide adequate to and from access to the subdivision. Mr. Ruble stated that the sketch that shows the deceleration and acceleration lanes in the Thoroughfare Plan are a sketch that is used for guidance only. The acceleration and deceleration lanes are not adequate for access of emergency vehicles. Mr. Ruble stated they strive to maintain the capacity on highly traveled roadways. He stated Goeller Boulevard is classified as a secondary arterial in that area and these lanes would maintain access capacity on

this roadway.

Mr. Bergman stated that the gravel area going south from Two Mile House Road is a 22-foot wide private place. He stated it was important to know that immediately to the west in the grassy area is a 25-foot wide strip of right-of-way that has been dedicated to the City of Columbus by Mr. Blunck, who owns the adjoining property. Mr. Bergman stated that there is a total of 47 feet of right of way possible at this location. He stated where the conflict is that the 47 feet coming from the north and the property coming from the south did not align. He stated if a street would be constructed at this location, they would have to purchase some property off the Runge Minor Plat or they could purchase land from the INDOT highway facility. Mr. Bergman stated access to this property has been the primary issue with this site.

Mr. Fisher opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Barry Kastner, President of the Terrace Lake Association Incorporation, which adjoins this property spoke on behalf of the Association. Mr. Fisher stated that he had a letter from Mr. Kastner that was sent to the Planning Department. Mr. Kastner stated they had concerns regarding the stub road requirement being built to the property line and into the woods. He stated there is a water main in an easement to the north of the neighborhood. They would like to see an engineering study as to how this water main would be accessed. Mr. Kastner expressed concerns regarding the sewer easement and the lake usage of motorized watercraft. He stated that they would like to see a complete drainage plan submitted for review by the City Engineer's Office. He also expressed concern regarding the high hazard dam at Terrace Lake and requested a new proposal from the applicant that avoids placing families downstream from this. He stated that he did not oppose the development but would like these issues addressed.

Mr. Bill Fox stated that he had offices located on Goeller Boulevard and Tupleo. He asked how the levy at Fire Station #5 at Goeller and Terrace Lake would be affected. He stated there is always flooding at this site, which blocks the street.

Mr. Scott Kiefer expressed concerns about traffic taking a short cut coming from State Road 46 West. He stated there was increased traffic at his residence. He stated his house was directly behind the dam. He stated there was nothing but mud and marsh located there. He also expressed concern about the drainage around his property.

Ms. Tupin-Crites asked Mr. Kastner if they objected to the complete project or just the northwest corner being developed. Mr. Kastner stated they do not object to the whole project, just the northwest corner and the low-lying land adjacent to the Fire Department. Mr. Brand asked if that included the area where they are proposing to connect with Goellar Boulevard. Mr. Kastner stated yes.

Mr. Gray stated the construction and tying on to the water main that the City has installed would not be a problem. He stated they have no intentions of undermining the tow of the dam or restricting any flow in that area. He stated the sanitary sewer capacity for the City of Columbus would be able to handle this subdivision. He stated the City will be doing some expanding and during dry time, the system is adequate. Mr. Gray stated it is when the rain comes that we have trouble with combination sewers that are very old. He stated Columbus City Utilities have required the plans and they have not indicated they cannot service this area. He stated Mr. Conwell has addressed this. He stated a drainage plan would be submitted when the final construction document is presented. Mr. Gray stated it was his opinion that the drainage would be improved in that area. He stated they had proposed two retention areas that will help with the

flooding and drainage. Mr. Gray stated that Terrace Lake has an obligation to maintain their dam in satisfactory condition.

Ms. Melissa Kiefer asked where the retention and detention areas were located. Mr. Gray stated one would be in the south that particular lake would act as a retention and detention area in the southwest portion of the area.

Mr. Fisher closed the meeting to the meeting.

Ms. Zeigler stated she was concerned about the entrance. She stated that there have been accidents coming out of the curve. She also expressed concern about speed in that area, particularly on the south side. Mr. Ruble stated that acceleration and deceleration lanes would help with providing a more safe area.

Mr. Conwell stated he was trying to create a quaint and personal style of neighborhood.

Mr. Ruble stated he did not have adequate information to address the stub street to the south.

Ms. Tupin-Crites asked if it was appropriate to ask for more drainage plans before a decision was made on this request. Mr. Fisher stated yes. Mr. Bergman stated that the Commission should give Mr. Gray more direction on this, especially if there is a specific area of concern.

Mr. Brand stated that the answer to the stub street, which would meet everyone's interest was the signing of an easement, but not requiring the street be built as long as the easement is in place.

Mr. Bergman stated that the reserved right of way creates some uncertainties about the timing of that happening. He stated that some individuals are committed to improving some land they do not own.

Mr. Ruble stated that it was his opinion that by building the street and having it physically there in the future it is not a surprise to the homeowner.

Ms. Zeigler asked who would build the street. Mr. Gray stated the property owner to the south has agreed to pay for construction of the street. Mr. Bergman asked if they would be agreeable to platting that as right of way, but not improving it. Mr. Gray stated yes.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff supported the 26-foot wide streets. He stated that staff would recommend a continuance of this request until the June 2006 meeting.

Ms. Tupin-Crites made a motion to continue this request to the June 2006 meeting. Mr. Bonnell seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

PP-06-04: SOUTH PARK MAJOR SUBDIVISION – a request by T & K Rental, Inc. to subdivide 9.82 acres into 8 lots. The property is located on the south side of Marr Road approximately 265 feet east of Gladstone Avenue in the City of Columbus.

Mr. Thom Weintraut presented the staff information on this request.

Mr. Perry Cloyd with Midwest Surveying & Mapping and Tim Barr represented the petitioners.

Mr. Cloyd stated that they understood they have to make road improvements to the frontage of

Marr Road from the east property line to the intersection of Gladstone Avenue. He stated they would be installing 30-foot street pavement width and provides several curb options. Mr. Cloyd stated they are asking for relief from installing sidewalks along the frontage of both Marr Road and new local street Southpark Court. He stated there were no sidewalks or pedestrian traffic in the neighborhood.

Ms. Tupin-Crites asked the location of the nearest sidewalk. Mr. Ruble stated there is a project under development on State Street that would include sidewalks.

Mr. Brand asked how much of Marr Road would be included if they had to install the sidewalks.

Mr. Bergman stated it was the entire distance to Gladstone.

Mr. Fisher opened the meeting to the public.

There was no one to speak for or against this request.

Mr. Fisher closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend the request be continued to the June 2006 meeting because of the need to see the improvement on Marr Road that is required. He stated the applicant will have a chance to correct the street cross section and staff would recommend sidewalks be installed as part of the street systems.

Mr. Cloyd stated they would like to avoid a continuance.

Mr. Cloyd asked exactly what the Commission wanted him to do. Mr. Ruble stated that a standard street cross section should be shown on the drawing. Mr. Ruble stated that would include widening of the existing pavement, installation of curbs, gutters and sidewalks on their side.

Mr. Bonnell made a motion to approve this request with the following conditions: (1) Road improvements are made subject to the Engineer's satisfaction, (2) The interior street would be 30 feet minimum pavement width, and (3) Elimination of sidewalks within the development and along Marr Road. Ms. Tupin-Crites seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 6-3 with Mr. Ruble, Mr. Gerstle and Ms. Zeigler being the nay votes.

ANX-06-01: JOSEPH AND LISA CONNER ANNEXATION – a request to annex to the City of Columbus approximately 25.52 acres, located on the north side of County Road 200 South, 750 feet east of I-65. The property is located in Columbus Township and is contiguous to the city as required by Indiana State Law.

Ms. Laura Thayer presented the staff information on this request.

Mr. Ted Darnell with Crowder & Darnell and Lisa Conner represented the petitioner.

Mr. Darnell stated that this is the first step in developing this property into residential lots. He stated that the 89 lots estimated were based on just this petition. He stated that they plan to develop the property to the north and to the east also. He stated there maybe 150 lots total. He stated this property is prime land for development and the annexation was needed for the future development.

Mr. Fisher opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Scott Conrad asked what type of housing would be located in this development.

Ms. Conner stated the lots would be large and in the first phase home prices will be between \$200,000 and \$250,000 per house.

Mr. Fisher closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bergman stated that staff would recommend sending this to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.

Motion: Mr. Gerstle made a motion to send this to the City Council with a favorable recommendation. Mr. Russell seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 9-0.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

LIAISON REPORTS

Written reports were received and discussed.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:15 P.M.

David L. Fisher, President

Steven T. Ruble, Secretary